

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignim 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,207	12/01/2000	Yoshiyuki Nagai	50026/005002	4421
31496	7590 07/14/2003			
SMITH PATENT CONSULTING CONSULTING, LLC			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 272 ALEXANDRI	6 A, VA 22301		MOSHER, MARY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	$\overline{}$
			DATE MAILED: 07/14/2003	[4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No. 09/728,207 Applicant(s)

Examiner

Art Unit

Nagai et al

	iviosner	1048
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the corres	pondence address
THE REPLY FILED $4/18/03$ FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoir ejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a time allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ely filed amendment which place	ication. A proper reply to a final es the application in condition for
	EPLY [check only a) or b)]	·
a) The period for reply expires months from the	e mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST See MPEP 706.07(f).	r reply expire later than SIX MONTHS	from the mailing date of the
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determing appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if chemailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce	ning the period of extension and the c m: (1) the expiration date of the short lecked. Any reply received by the Off	corresponding amount of the fee. The sened statutory period for reply originally fice later than three months after the
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 4/18/03 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	 Appellant's Brief must be filed 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of 	d within the period set forth in the appeal.
2. $oxdot{X}$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered bec	ause:	
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further of	consideration and/or search (see	NOTE below);
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	ow);	•
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in be issues for appeal; and/or	etter form for appeal by material	ly reducing or simplifying the
(d) \square they present additional claims without canceling a	a corresponding number of finally	y rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>See attachment.</u>		<u> </u>
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):	
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the no	n-allowable claim(s).	uld be allowable if submitted in
The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request f application in condition for allowance because: See attachment.	or reconsideration has been con	sidered but does NOT place the
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because by the Examiner in the final rejection.	use it is not directed SOLELY to	issues which were newly raised
7. X For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) explanation of how the new or amended claims wou	a) will not be entered or b) uld be rejected is provided below	will be entered and an or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 7-73	· .	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
3. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a) \square approved or \square	b) \square disapproved by the Examiner.
$\Theta.$ \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
O. D Other: Interview Summers		

Art Unit: 1648

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed April 18, 2003 would obviate the at least the 112 2nd issues. However, broadening the scope to any Sendai vector containing a foreign gene, or to any Sendai virus with modified NP, P, or L, would require additional search and consideration of non-"disseminative" embodiments that were previously excluded from the claimed subject matter. Also, entry of the amendment would require consideration of the new issue of the effective date of claims as amended, and require consideration of new double patenting issues for copending applications with claims directed to Sendai "lacking disseminative capability".

Double Patenting

Applicant argues that the provisional double patenting rejections are improper because the other applications were filed later than this application, citing MPEP 706.02(k). However, these are double patenting rejections, not rejections based on prior art under 35 US 102(e). The relevant citation is MPEP 804. Applicant is correct in arguing that the later filed applications are not available as prior art, that is why the provisional double patenting rejections were not accompanied by provisional rejections under 35 USC 102(e) or 35 USC 103. Applicant argues that submission of a terminal disclaimer is only appropriate when the earlier filed applications have matured to a patent. If the only rejections remaining in an application are those of provisional double patenting, it is proper to withdraw the provisional rejection(s) in the first application to issue, and maintain the rejection(s) in applications issuing later. However, there are other rejections remaining in this application, therefore the provisional rejections are maintained until all

Art Unit: 1648

other issues are resolved. Meanwhile, copending application 09/436,504 has matured to a patent, therefore the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is no longer provisional.

Applicant argues that 09/436,504 is not commonly assigned and cannot be avoided through the filing of a terminal disclaimer. However, there is a common inventor; and the claimed subject matter is not patentably distinct from the claims in the other application (now a patent). therefore the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is proper. The instant claimed invention broadly drawn to recombinant Sendai virus encoding a foreign gene, methods of producing protein, and allantoic fluid containing the virus and expressed protein, is not patentably distinct from the previously patented claims more narrowly drawn to an egg containing a recombinant Sendai virus encoding a cytokine, the chorioallantoic fluid, and process of producing the cytokine. In this case, one of ordinary skill in the art would have seen the generic claims involving "foreign gene" as obvious over the species claims "cytokine" since a cytokine would have been instantly recognizable as a gene foreign to Sendai virus, and use of any foreign gene in a vector suggests use of many other foreign genes to those of ordinary skill in the vector art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary E. Mosher, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-2926. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday and alternate Fridays from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel, can be reached on (703) 308-4027. The fax phone numbers for this Group are now Art Unit: 1648

(703) 872-9306 for Before Final responses, and (703) 872-9307 for After Final responses. Faxes for this Group can also be sent to (708) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

July 9, 2003

MARY E. MOSHER PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP, 1800